

**UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY**

OU_212416

**UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY**

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No.

824

Accession No.

18244

Author

Bisc Bridges, R.

Title

Collecting essays papers

This book should be returned on or before the date
last marked below.

COLLECTED ESSAYS

COLLECTED
ESSAYS PAPERS &c.
of
ROBERT BRIDGES

XVI

THE BIBLE

XVII

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

XVIII

SIR THOMAS BROWNE

XIX

GEORGE SANTAYANA

XX

THE GLAMOUR OF GRAMMAR

Oxford University Press
HUMPHREY MILFORD
LONDON

1934

Printed in Great Britain
at the University Press
Oxford
by John Johnson
Printer to the University

PREFACE

THIS NUMBER of Robert Bridges' Collected Prose contains his Essays on Prose Works, including an article on the English Language.

In the next Number I propose to reprint his Essays on musical subjects.

The usual notes on the phonetic alphabet will be found at the end of this book.

M. M BRIDGES

XVI
THE BIBLE

FIRST PRINTED

Times Literary Supplement

23 March 1911

*down to scholarship of the nation:
the rest is now published for the first time.*

THE BIBLE

W H A T *England wud hav hin if die Bible had never bf come a household book if a hypothetical problim for the moral flosofer; and if wi ask hav much wi owe tu the literary excellence of avr translation, chatt question if not a wholly literary won, but it haf a very important literary aspect, of which wi my ventur tu spiik wichavt intrudin vpon moralf or thiology or che fuld of esoteric scolar ship. Tor 300 years, and wi my almost say from che date of the first dissemination of Tindale'f New Testament, zh? averag Englishman haf bun svbjectid tu an influence of incalculable magnitude, thegreiter hcavfe hi haf bun vnaware of its vnyifual caracter; for the Bible that hi haf red and nvurd haf not only more bewty than eny other vernacular rendering that eny other nation hafpofesst, bvt it if in its v'ital parts more biwti ful and intimat than its originalf. Hire if a cayfe of all manner of iffects, moral, intillectual, and isihetic. in mere isfhetic—that the book which has bun prefent in all our nvrserief and scoolrooms shud hav bun the best concuvable model of simple stfie and natural hwty, imsistibly influencing for good every divelopment of ovr*

THE BIBLE

literature, and, even when lust perceevd, still bi con' trast or sympathy persistently attracting everything tu wards the centralfitnesses and essential forces ofqhtnes —this we most recognise tu be a puce of extravagant good for tune. As for the moral rtplt, in estimatin) the se it most not be overlookt zhat, if the English hav riMy profited bi the pofesion of the best Bible in Europe, they most hav the credit of having produced it; and that die same love and devotion, which bravd marterdom tu make it, wer latent also in chair harts tu receeve it.

It was genuin enthusiasm for a high moral ideal which made the bewty. if wyclif and his associates provided the seed, it was Tindale and Coverdale whoo reifd the plant; the revisers of 1611 only prund and treind it; and allavity everything for the favvr of the time, when ovr languag was jvst aqsity tu r'yval all antiquity in shake speare, and vfihen the national mind, in its stroggle tu deliver itself from an age Aoty bondag, had favnd its cap' tans and fihtin men in a company whoose feifh and hope wer fixt in the 'written word'—yet, allovin for the se condition}, the fact that a man tyke coverdale cud put words tugethe as hi he did was worthy tu be included in die doctrin of verbal inspiration, and the feet most hav helpt not a little tu confirm thatt notion in the common mind.

THE BIBLE

While Tindale was wvrkity alone in exple ther was no promis in English literature, chancer'f tyht had set in darknis; tho' hi had di'd less than 150 yiarf hfore, hi was not so iisily red as hi is tudey; and Wyckuf's Bible, tho' more vernacular in style than Chaucer, was sufferin the same obsolescence. Shakespeare, without whoom wi can reckon nothin, was vnborn. it was vnforsun and vnimaginable that at thatt time a book shud arise vn matcht in the world for its biwties and mastery of style.

The style of prose iludef differentiation and discrip' tion; it if won ofthe most complex and intangible of all finomina that invite distinction, but its history in Wes' tern Europe offerf a simple classification intu twoo man divisons, the Ciceronian and the Non'Ciceronian or Romantic. Thife termf are not satisfactory, but the chey dco indicate a rial distinction. Cicero, founding himself on the Gruk oratorf, perfectid a manner of writin which wherever it was known, effectid European literature. Since hi wrote in the languag which was for centuries written and spoken bi all the lermd all over Europe, wi cannot syppose diat eny wvn cud wholly iscape from syme relics of hif tradition; but hif art was so ilaborat that widiavt familiarity and practice it cud not bi ap' prodht or attemptid; and it if so far rimoovd from

THE BIBLE

colloquial spuch and vntreind ixpresion as tu bi almost vnintelligible and ripvlsiv tu the natural man. "Won value of its varnisht svrfuce if that it svbduief and har' monizis die most nfractory material, and can uven biwtify thi abstract and scientific term? Mdh are so obnoxivs tu the pictorial instinct of the Romantic stile. Won my sey of a whole class of words and frasis, the simple spnth'cvrrency and direct homely idiom?, Mdh are the basis of die Romantic profe, that they are in danger of loofity force in the harmon'yzity or varnishin process; while of thi other class, the more abstract, lernid, indirect, and allusiv term , that it if only in thi tlaborat art that they can be suitably accommodated. This then makes a practical distinction; and its actual significance my bi illvstratid bi the nception which Addison and his school found in th? eihutntti century. Ad' miration of his apparent art led papele tu sy that English prose had never bun written before; and yet no won wud contend that hi, or any won whoo us'd thatt manner, ever wrote enythin comparable tu the biwty of the best parts of die Bible, or was capable of approdhith) it.

Our Bible, then, is. in die Romantic stile of prose; and, comparing our literature widi die won literature in the world widi which wi can ful pride in company it,

THE BIBLE

wi my say that tu die Gmks Herodotus'? history held somfthin like the same literary position af our Bible holds wizh vs—an erly and inimitable masterpnce of abovndin) natural grace, whcofe simple dharm set it above the ruch of the consivs rules of grammarians,, a model which no won whoo had sufficient taste tu admire wud attempt tu rival.

'How happy would a man be could he imitate Hero dotus! [wqtes Lucian]. I do not say in all his perfect tions,for that would be too great a wish; but either in the beauty of his discourse, or in the gravity of his sentences, or in the delicacy of his lonique tongue, or (to be short) in a thousand other advantages, which make all those who would attempt it, despairing, drop their pens!

Wi hav even this delicacy of the lonique tongue in ovr Bible, and won miht push the comparison niarer; for Herodotus's book ha? bun not vnfeirly discrib'd as a thristic perspectiv of accredited events from the Grik point of viw—a story of Divine prdestiny, makity the world's history tu cvlminate in the glory of Athens; just a; ovr Bible is a collection of christian origins, colmi natin in the foundation of the chorch; and both wer

THE BIBLE

historically jvstifi"d. But avr Bible, matdhiti) die Qruk hcokin its legendary matter and ixcvrsionfintu old'wvrl'd history, if mvfli more poetic and varyd than Herodotus; and its sorcif hity more original, die documents Mdh it collects are far richer in mental attitudef and literary formf, and hav iscapt die tinctjir of won mind. Its in' spir'd ehvationf above svdh a man, more than compel sate for dii immoralitief and sofistries diat lapse binith it And it if not only in poitry and moral inspiration that Herodotus if ovtmacht, for nven in naivety, wherin h? if svmtpmef ihavht tu hav excudid, hi if quite sor' passt Ther is nothin in literature tu compure which thatt passaf in the criarion where it is sed that when God had created the animals he'brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them .

The forin translation and vernacular renderins which adid in bilding up avr Bible wer so numervs, and its own rivisons so fruquent and complicated, that any dutail'd account if apt tu loofe siht of die man lines. A more general viw, disrigardin the complication, if forced back on the essential truth diat wi owe our Bible manly tu Tindale and Coverdale. The skill of dieframerf of thi. Authorized Version cannot bi too hihly prais'd but they wer inspird bi the biwty of the temple diat had

THE BIBLE

bun alre dy reis d, and their skill was thatt ofsympa' thetic and lern?d imitation, their effort tu brir the whole vp tu die standard ofthe best. The to chis made bi their best commitis wer delicat and bitiful, won my liven say inimitable; and yet ifTindale'f Gospels of1526 wer tu be red nov in ovr chorchis wi shud very of n bi on' aware of eny difference, and in meny cas?f of discrep' ana wi can su that wi shud hav btcvme as attadht tu th? older as wi are tu the later version; and ther are some cast} in which thi older sums ike better. Tindale, whco workt from thi original texts, printed the whole ofhif New Testament, and left hif MS. of thi old, affar (it if sed) af the 2nd Book of chronicles. Coverdale, whoo workt chifly from other translation, ricis'd Tin' dale, and svppfyd the r?meinder. The Great Bible, which is the basis of zh? Authorized version, if Coverdale's rivison of his first comphte book. Bvt even in this skehton svmmary w? most not omit the fortenth century translator, whoofe erly and forcible English was thi ssential foundation of everythin, and no dovt a familiar and influential model for Tindale, whoo, find in the man Ipnef leid davn, set tu work in the right method. Here, for instance, if a verse from Wyclifs Gospelfi—

THE BIBLE

And he criede and seyde, Yadir Abraham have merci on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dippe the ende of his fyngur in watir and kele my tonge, for I am turmentid in this flawme.'

Tindale diangd ende intu tippe. in thise days of shlip printin it wud h well if Wyclifs Bible of 1389 wer pvbliM for die general ytse of thofe whoo rud Chaucer; for it ranks a? hih amon thi incunabula of avr languag.

A for Coverdalef work, it if inof tu sty diat the Psalms in ovr Prayer-book are a sample of it. The greit hwty of the ir spuflly rythm and the ir Ufy lyrical tone hav made the m universally bdvvd. Their hap' hazard recitation if a man attraction in ovr deily ser' vicif, and the y exhibit well dii extrordinary merits of this translator. H? if comparable tu die Yrenihman Amyot, whoo, not brin himself an original avfhor, made a classic in hif translation of Plutarch, acclimatizir the svmufhat stiff Grttk widi lively Gallic grace, and tndav in his nativ languag widi happy xpresionf. Hire if a specimen from coverdalef Bible of 1533:—

'Behold thou hast herde what the kynges of Assiria have done unto all londes, and how they damned them, and shalt thou be delyvered? Have the goddes of y

THE BIBLE

*Heithen delivered them, whom my father destroyed,
as Gosan, Haran, Reseph, and the children of Eden
which were at Thalassar? where is the kyng of
uemath, y^e kyng of Arphad, eir the kyng of y^e cite
sepharvaim, Hena and ivaf*

*Bvt this my perhaps hfrom Tindalef MS. in ike Great
Bible Couerdale gets rid of rite snperfluvs first and
(which was absent in Wyclif), rudin londes, how
they utterly destroyed them.*

*A book that has bin put tugether in such a manner bi
different translators, whoo us'd varivs sorcis, and rivis'd
their own and uch other's work, and wer indiscriminatly
rivisd bi outsiders, cannot hav zliatt literary yinity
uthidh can jvstly forbid fyr the r ivison, nor can it bi held
tu bi so perfict as tu bi incapable of amendment. Even
thofe whoo mantein die strotyposition that thi Author
ized version is a literary monument of its own date,
which shud not bi tampered with, can bi fully answer'd.
Rivison wil not annihilate the book; it wil still nmein
in the sarief of old tyble just as lindalef Testament
nmein?; it wil mirely hav its own nvifon? and svcces'
sors, as hi has his, it if the n a practical question of ex
pudieny; wi hav tu consider ufliefher ovr Bible can bi
rivis'd without detriment tu its literary biwty, which wi*

THE BIBLE

hold tu bi af valuable tu the chvrdis as it if tu the scholarship of the nation.

Nov if wi are tu hav an imprcoved or vndamagd Bible, it if manifest zhat our rivisers most rilinguish eny idin of pidantic fidelity tu thi original text if an accnrat modern translation if nqu[rd, let zhett bi made in modern style for thi use ofthofe whoo nad it It wil not bi avr chvrdd hook, nor avr household trefvr. It wud ply havoc wizz the best, the diarist, and the most duply rcotid association of avr Ibfe and literature. Our Ri VIS'd Bible, if it if tu hip -die place ofzfn old wvn, mvst bi made wizz thi vtmost conservatizm, and wizz a niarer sympathy for thi old book zhan wi dare look for. Wi hav pleinely tu confess zhat wiful no confidence zhat the rivfrferf wil doo well. Wi hav lately sun, in thi 1881 Rivifon of the New Testament, zhat mire lernin) and p[vs intention are not tu bi trvstid; and if rtiatt com' mitti did not doo af mvdh damagaf waf possible vnder the circvmstancif, their fellowf are vrgity zhat the horrible work shud bi ixtendid. Fortwatly the whole consensus of literary taste if ageinst them; so zhat ther if no mid tu ssy more. "Wvn example of their wvrk my bi given; the magnificent exordivm of thi Oration tu The He brews' commencif zhvs in their text:—

THE BIBLE

'God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in His Son, whom he appointed heir of all things.'

This has been lately quoted in the columns of The Times as sufficient to damn the whole, and Purely it is: for the passage thus misapplied was of a fine and anything could be. And yet the book was not without its use just because the revisers avowed their aim and showed plainly what there was to fear; and their work may have awakened many to the real danger; and they too themselves took warning so that the subsequent revision of the old Testament was a better and more conservative performance. The second half of the old Testament, which Tindale had not traversed, was also (perhaps for that reason) the worst part of the 1611 revision, and therefore a more favorable for the reformer's learning), and that part of the 1881 revision is generally preferable. And they would not allow their old Testament to be sold separately from their New Testament, it became involved in the condemnation and dislike which that book had provoked; and it is not so well known (given to the present writer) as it would otherwise have been but good as much of

THE BIBLE

it if, wipliid zhat it my not h riciivd affinal wizhavl careful examination and amendment For instance, zhi openity of Genesis in zhatt nw Bible if given zhvs:—

in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was waste and void; and dark'ness was upon the face of the deep: and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

The hwty, it wil h sun, if gone; hcavfe zhi ace sovnd in waste die niw wvrd svbstityitid for zhe sonorvs without form) clafhif wizh zhi ace o/face. it wud siim zhat if zhe rtvyerf had red zheir wvrk alovd, zhey mvst hav perciivd Ms. it if anvzher piice of wanton damag; and it wud hi strange ifzhi only example of zhe kpnd wer in zhi openir sentence. The passag quotid if vzherwfce disappointin hcavfe zhi end of it, which looks af if it call'dfor ade, if left af it was, which the satisfactory part of zhi original if ruind.

it wudsiim zhen zhat zhe (htologianf whoo are vrgent for rivion vnderestimat die valve of literary biwty, or are incapable ofvnderstanditt) it. wi vrge zhat zhepopylarity of ovr Bible haf biin manly due tu diepneminence of its literary hwty; not, of corse, hcavfe zhatt excel' lence if zhi intillectyual judgment of critics, bvt hcavfe zhe

THE BIBLE

verbal biwty if die actual meenf ufherety die spirit wisely charms the hart if the Wycliffite Bible and Tindale'f and Coverdale'f books wer in everybody'f reedh, ther wud be less tu far; since educated men wud hav the history hfore their ies, and wud hjebsly al\ve tu die encroihment of modernization. The danger if diat a gradual deterioration my at lengzh rob the nation of the ir birfhqht, while ther is not inof current lernin tu perceeve it Our Bible wud stand a good deel of mortal injvry before it expird in commonplace clerical amend' ments; and diis incvrages meticulvs meddlerf of all kinds tu amufe diemself bi wantonly hackin at it, af they think with impunity. But if the 1881 Revision of the New Testament wer tu be enjoin d on die chvrddh and distributed tu diepeople, a later revision of thatt miht tvmble diem intu die ditdh wizh the ir blnd gides. Their Bible wud begone, it wud be tu diem af a Yrenih Bible is tu a Frenihman or an Italian Bible tu an Italian.

Won most misdheivos misvnderstandin if die objection tu ufliat are ca/Wd 'obsolete wvrd'f and'frafef. Nov Purely die clergy shud see dtat die sacred books shud not be in the speeih of die market, if the r if eny mystery tu be garded in religion, hav if it tu be excluded from the languag, and what languag can be us'd with dignity and

THE BIBLE

security save thatt ufhidi tradition and use hav const' cmtidi

Won wud think that ther are meny casif in ufhifli an vnfamilinr word most bi an advantag. The best hope of intelligent vnderstandin if that inquiry shud bi arovs'd, and it if set tu ship bi familiar or commonplace w presionf. Thi onusual word asserts itself, stimulates inquiry, and dimandf definition. And wi find that this pritence that simple folk are held off bi oncommon words is pusht bi won of our wud bi riviser ageinst the proverb,

'Though thou shouldest bray a fool in a mortar among wheat with a pestle, yet will not his foolishness depart from him!

and lu wud svbstityite pound for bray. A; if proverbf did not priferve, difyne, and uven criate languag—and af if common folk did not still use the m—and af if eny won, whco did not liv in far of the mortar, wud not thank God for the word. such rivisers seem tu bi bisily qualiin for the punishment that was unjusstly mited ovt tu the translatorf. what miht not a committe of chise men doo? sir John Cheke, who objected tu a lien words, thauht proselyte indifemsible and with a dark

THE BIBLE

*proficy of the undergaduet, wud hav had die
Scriptyir rvn divs:—*

*'woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!
for ye compass sea and land to make one freshman,
and when he is made, &c, &c.'*

*It is well that svdh svggestionf are somtimes amuf
in, it sums tu vs that die languag of our Bible is per'
fictly intelligible, and diat its antiquity is of die greitist
service in kupin die puple in todi widi our older das'
sicol literature. Thi Elizabethan Bible is ; die won
omniprefent bond, and its loss wud h irreparable. chi U
dren brauht up tu reed it are alredy alongside Shakespeare;
and wi shud jelvsly gard diis privihgfor diem; rimem'
berin, too, diat our seventnnfh'century spiich is far
more stable dian enyfhin) which wi can substitute for it.
Like die vyramidf, or avr own Cafhiidralf, its monw
ments wil rimein, ufltfie avr little temporary havfif,
whoofefa Monf svcciid and pass—tho diey too hav dieir
fatid volutionf—my scon bi af out of date af enyfhity
else, if avr dimocracy shud bi educatid bi die niws'
paperf, and hav no fillip for its ridh inheritance of his'
torical literature, and bi incapable of riidin it, its mind
wil hi tike the arckitectur of avr Victorian svbvrbf and*

THE BIBLE

manufacturin towns. And ther if an educated vulgarity and self'consiusnes at the bottom of this prudery tuwards 'obsolete' expresionf. Wil the fe sticklerf for wvrd f tell vs ufliether it if on account of verbal accuracy or intellu gibility that the word slave dæ s not occvr in their Ri vis'd Versioni tho' paul's letter tu vhilemon if all about a rvnawey slave, and cannot bi understood unless zhatt bi made char.

We hav been acuity ageinst die fwise phi for sytw plicity; ther if who a false phi for truth, since modern scholarship demands an accurate translation. Nov, in order tu make a really accurat translation it if neassary that the filosofy of die Hebrews and Greeks and zfi eir metafysical [deaf hud be understood and defend, and feiftifullly reproduced bi a consistent use of special equu valent termf; and the fe doo not exist Our English wurds are labelf for uther [deaf, and cannot be readjusted and assorted tu matdh wizh [deaf that are outside avr mental horizon. This makes eny pretence of verbal accuracy in a literary translation impossible; it if not wizltin zlie cumpass of human skill.

But we cannot deel wizh all the pros and cons of re vifon. Ther is, as we hav sed, no teenable a. priori objection tu revifon, while ther is a wholesum fear of

THE BIBLE

revisers, and this fear wi share tu she full They, on the ir part, can justly complein of prejudice, and rihtly assert that svme of the ir opponents wud never be phiiA wizh enythin that the they did. Won Sondey mornin, after a service where die old Testament lesson had been red from die 1881 book, we remember harity three men of eminent ability and vnquestiond literary taste discvss the merits of zhatt version, and the thay all agreed that won word in the lesson had been particularly offensiv tu them, and vnmistokably betryd the reviers' prentice hand. Nov zhatt wvrd was in the Authorized version, and die verse in ufliidh it occvrd was vnihangd in the revifon.

We think that the reviers wud more redily win our confidence if we sav that they recognizd hew much literary skill if needed tu make a translation. Our quotationffrom Hebrews and Genesis how dtat the y hav not had competent English wqteri on the ir committer, or diat they hav neglected the ir advice, indeed, in their New Testament, so far from triit tu write good Eng'lish, they seem tu hav spent their facvlties in quibblin over preposition; and tensef. Nov the description of Wyclifs method is extant in die Prologue tu die later text of hi; Bible; and it conteinf svm excellent good

THE BIBLE

sense, it wud apptar that hi shmd tu get all his scholarship and lernin well bihind him bifore hi enter'd on his forth and final stage, when hif program was—

'To translate as cleerli as he coude to the sentence, and to have maniegode felawis and kunning at the cor'rection of the translation.'

This if txactly ufhat wi ask for; this wud reconcile vs; this wud satisfy vs. Many good fellows at the correction of the translation. Wi with wi my get them.

XVII

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

FIRST PRINTED

in 'The Speaker'

PART I

1 April 1905

PART II

8 April 1905

XVII

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

I

T H E Oxford vress has given vs The pilgrim's Progress illvstratid bi cruikshank in twentyfve wood' cvts diat are niw tu die pvblic. The preface ricordf Coleridge's pigment that this book if 'incomparably the best summa iheologiae Evangelicae ever produced by a writer not miraculously inspired', uftifte an advertifment procleimf die verdict of cvrrent art criticism, diat this grotesk portryer ofsobvrban imaginations, the master of die comic almanacks, if its [dial illvstrator. Παράδοξόν τι τοῦτο. Certainly die second pictur, vkiih shows the sin'bvrderid christian pofesst bi the far of Hell, as in hedloty fliht from die doomd city hi hive? hif little family tu dieirfate, if an admirable prefentation of the spirit of the text, and wurzhy of all preife; liven dii artist's bravd method of shadin happenin tu strjipe won of christian's stockins lenthwise and thi other bandwise,

¹ *The Pilgrim's Progress, by John Bunyan, illustrated with 25 drawings on wood by Ceorgt Cruikshank from the collection of Edwin Truman (Henry Trowde, Oxford University Press, 1904).*

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

accentuates die distraction of die raggid inftiufiaft. Let vs ixamin zhe situation.

christian 's adventurfare Bunyan 's spiritual expnru encif. Nau zhi only occafon on which Bunyan can bi sed tu hav difertid hif family waf in November, 1660;¹ ufhen on biin arrested hi rifus'd beil and subsiquently chose tu continue in jeil rather zhan promis not tu gazher die puple tugezher in vnlayful assemblies it if true zhat it waf difficvltfor him tu avoid this offence; bvt die magistrates, whoo had bun vnwillirn tu imprison him, made compromfae iify. Hi, havever, persisted zhat if hi wer letfru hi wud wilfully breik zhe lav. Sepaw Hon from hif wtfe and dhildren waf painful; yet, havity die dhoice bitwun silence wizh imprisonment and silence widi frudom, hif consience forced him tu prifer die maturial fetterf and hive hif family tu die dharity of dieirfrendf. Wizh so mvdi knolidg of die facts wi my new tvrn tu die story.

Wyn cannot look for perfectid art, nor uvenfor con' sistency, in a Ion) alligory, and die qht difence of Bun' yanf rude tecnuik if zhat it makes no attempt tu satisfy artistic canonf. Havever mvdh dii interest my li in die

¹ *This and vzher facts in Bunyan'; history are taken from die mcent tygrnjies, tspzdnlly Venables and Froude.*

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

picturesk adventurf, die ruder soon percnevfe that die several incidents are typical episodef of a spiritual expurience, and that zheir minify if their spiritual munin tdiidh a strict interdependence and sequence miht iw ban ass. Bvt Bunyan's artistic avkwardmss if prodigivs. iher if a passag in the Gospel obovt a man hatin his wife and children for the kingdom 's sake, and hi had lately found this tu hav a practical manityfor himself; bvt h waf thenfar advanced on his pilgrimage, had in' dud known all its expuriencif save only the very last; hi was ilect of God, a call'd aposle and pradhher, who rinounced his family rather than his hih vocation; tdieraf christian in zhe story if in a very different stage; hi had not nvenfovnd the wey; nofhity cornsponds. The facts of the story are diat a man lernify that the tovn in whichhi livd was doomd tu distrvction diervpon ran away and left his wtfe and children tu their fate, rhatt pivs pagan Aeneas wud hav had them all on his back. It if a difastrvs openityjor it dipqvfe die hiro ofintellu gent sympathy. And die story, biity bad in itself, if not excus'd or susteind bi thi alltgory. it if in die natur of fhityfzhat 'babes' cannot share in spiritual convictionf of advlts, and zherefor svdh convictionf doo not sever a man from hif dchildren, nor doo diey interfire widi hif

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

duty of carin for them. The story asserts the opposit, and thi only moral tyu bi dravn from it is that a man shud not marry if hi wud save his sol; but John Bunyan was marry'd twice.

it wer no sounder criticifm tu disparag Bunyan's ri markable book than it is tu overpreise it, but the eccessiv lavdations of it are riplite with paradoxis which invite discrimination. For instance, it if difficvlt tu reconcile Froude's just cjondemnation of Bunyan's narrow thiology with his assertion that all is conceived in the large wide spirit of humanity itself. I propose tu ixamin Mr. Talkative, whom hi silects tu preife, af 'one of the best figures that mnyan has drawn. Dean Stanley also says admirinly, 'we too, as he, have met Mr. Talkative; and Canon Venables apprcovef the testimony. New, when Mr. Talkative comes in with his label thi old frends of Miss Bates anticipate plesor but when on brin twice questioned, hi riplis in Bunyan's most succinct manner, they are left in blank disappointment. After this hi makes, it if true, svme effort in caracter; but insted of talkin he tells us that hi does talk and that hi loves talkin, and hi svuggests svbjctsf for talk. Then chris' tian sets Faithful at him, and poor Talkative if nouftiere; hi if feirly lectjird off the stage; hi if constreind tu

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

blush and with drav. wi nov see that hi is not talkativ in thi ordinary sense; and since christian kniw him at home, and givs a loty account of him, wi my gather thi avfhor'f intention. Thise, then, are his characteristics. That he talks about religion without practising it, yea, and he will talk when he is on the ak'bench, and the more drink he hath in his crown the more of these things has he in his mouth. He is a saint abroad and a sinner at home. He rails at his family and servants, in trade he is a Turk and unjust' I most beg live tu wvnder ufliefher Dean Stanley waf rtally familiar wizh syfli a man; I cannot think zhat hi ixists. That hi ixistid in Bunyanf time I believe, and that hi is dravn from die life; bvt zher if hardly syfli a man novadeyf—a rvffian whoo discvssif jvstification and vreyer and Ziwbirth on thi ulcbenfli. Hi was a monster of his dty, sectarian, not human (in the large wide spirit of hwmanity.

Thi above criticism, in so far as it Just, hits Bunyan's admirers razher than Bunyan; and yet I am sure that I am held off from Bunyan bi just such a warpin or dwarfin of greit human tipes and motivs as wi find here. With thatt picturesk, forcible handlin for which hi is so justly ixtolYd, hi wil suze on svm greit human

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

topic and cast it davn nakid hfore our fa; and wi, in gratitude for hi? vivid nomenclature die value of which it if somtimes diffcylvt tu ixaggerate, my perhaps omit tu reckon hov much or hov little more hi haf given vs. Most men mvst hav wadid in die slough of Despond, and nvne can hav more redily ufd hif name for it zhan hav I; bvt it haf not iscapt mj attention that l never in mi despondency found eny assistance from christian's ad' ventur, where a man whoose name was Help came and pull'd him out, and told him that hi shud hav tri'd tu find the steps, did no wvn cud sit diem, nor are wi inform d of ufliat natur diey are. So agein widi Giant Despair—whoo in mi family was obstinatly mistaken bi the children for the rial huro—hav well namd hi is! Bvt what if this hi ofvromis bi which prisoners is cape from die Castle of Doubt? promis implies feifh in the promis, and it if iurely pst dii iclipse or lack offeifh that they are sufferin from. Bunyan's ixact munin is not plein, but jvdgin from die riliif which comes on son' tyny deyf, and from die hi biin all die while in christian fpockit, I conclude that this Dovt and Dispeir are a mood, uftiidh miht pass off of itself as it sumf tu doo. Nov, in so far af this mood if corponnl or mental, it haf its corponal and mental medicin: or ifhunyan wil

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

rigard it as spiritual, then the cure for those in this condition if sympathy wizh zheirfellowcriturf and thi activity of good wrks; and his kn had bun better made of thatt metal Agein, nothin cud bi more happily nam'd than his Vanity Fair, bvt rid hi; catalog of feiritys, where hi seys, 'Therefore at this fair are all such merchandise sold as...!' I cud not brin mi hand tu copy hif list, m wil take occafon of a fool'f abuse of good thins tu cahmniat goodnis, and with indiscriminate volgarity hi confawnds good and bad in won category of uvil. it mvst hav hin stomblitn at such ineptitudes that led William Cory, when hi 'skimmed' the pilgrim's Progress, tu ricord his dovnriht opinion that it waf 'wretched stuff' The languag of Itfe sumf tu hav bun translatid intu a dialect bi mnyan and tu mid rutrans' lation bifore it can hav eny munin for vs.

une if anvzher paradox, ufhidh Yroude hall state for himself, in hif account of John mnyan hi introducif him afike man 'whose writings have for two centuries affected the spiritual opinions of the English race in every part of the world more powerfully than any book or books except the Bible'. Bvt on p. 62 hi drops zhe following rimark: 'unfortunately, parents do not read mnyan, he is left to the children.' Nov zhis obiter dictum is qufte

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

just, and die truth of it is unfortunat for nothin so much as for the credit of^rroude } man opinion—vnkss, indud, what Mr. Froude mint was that his own generation was the first tu mglect mnyan; for Children doo not attend tu christian's flvology, nor wud they understand it if They did; it has, of corse, no influence on their spiritual opinions. ' All fables have their morals, but the innocent enjoy the story/ and their bvefor it is manly due tu its bity the consicratid mans of their in' dulgence in adventurs and fihts with grants and fiarsom monsters on a Sunday, when their favorit pastimes are forbidden. I hesitatid tu trust mi impresion of general experience in zhis matter, and made svm in' quiry with this risult of forty two person reprisent in varivs classis, conditions, and districts, whoom I took bi hazard, I found that nine had never red the pilgrim's Progress at all, and won was doutful whether hi had ever sun die book, of die thirty twoo zher wer twenty five whoo had not red it since childhud; and, of die seven rimeinin thier know it only from riidin it tu their Children. Riturnin now tu the thirty twoo whoo had red it, twenty won ripudiatid die notion that they had ever got eny good from it spiritually or morally, of the ri meinin ileven ther wer thrim whoo admitud that they

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

miht hav ricnvd an impulse for good action; twoo wer mirely respectful tuwards it; thrii likt it, won for literary rison sonly; and three disfykt it.

II

AS a child's sunday storybook the pilgrim's Progress has bun almost universally red; but the notion that any sound educational use cud bi made of it sumi tu mi wron; for as a pictur of christian life it has this bad blemish, that it mglects the practical side of morale of faith, hope, and hue, the greititst hne iffeiih; and tho' Bunyani thiology supposis works tu bi of no account in themselves, and that they wil flow sufficiently and spontanivlsly from feith, yet for his own pictorial porpos hi shud hav sun that works make the true portrature of feith, and that christian's feifh, peintid without the works of love, if somtimes in danger of appiarin very like Mr. Talkative's, (A ; an artist I thud hav thavht that all thatt quiir dogmatism about Christ's three or for

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

rihtosnessis which is dravn avt of Mr. Greatheart bi Mrs. christian's silly question as tu hou Christ can hav eny left for himself ifhigivf so mvdh away—wud hav bun well placed in Mr. Talkative'f movfh) christian, af wi sn him, if selfishly his own salvation; hi care for nothin else. St. Paul, wi can sn, wud hav died for man as redily af did hif Master; ther if nothiq in christian of this sort of devotion. Hi if set pity bi the fiar of Hell; hi liives his family tu distrvction and pvr' sues his wey alone. Thdhi ricuvef help from meny, hi helps nobody; hi find favlt with everybody; hi livs for himself and God, not for God and hif neihbor. it wud sum a more genervs and wholesvm doctrin zliat wi dinp ovrselfef, not for ovrselfef, butfor vthe rf; and zliefiw instancif in vShiih christian Jhowf liven compasionfor vthe rfare avtweih'd bi the satisfaction wizh uthidh the downfall of vthe rf if rigardid. if Passion loffs at Patience in this wvrld, yet Patience 'will have as much reason to laugh at passion in the next', uftiither shi wil appar' ently transplant the temperf of vanity lair; and when God shall pass sentence on thi ignorant and wickid, it if won oj christian's cilestial plesvrs that hi wil 'have a voice in that judgment'. Hire if food for dhildren! For myself I can sty that I dislikt die man, and shud hav

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

*felt no concern had hi bun drovnd in zhatt last river,
rfio' I wiM Mr. Hopeful well fhru.*

*It wud bi very vnfeir on Bunyan tufyndfavlt with hif
art bicavfe it haffeil'd in pictyirin) ufhat if not given tu
zhe mind of man tu percuve, mvtti less tu discrete, and
zhat hi haf not imagind eny tolerable conditions for an
iternal Paradise. Bvt when hi talks of his 'crowns of gold'
and 'riding in an equipage with the King of Glory' (wie
kostlich!) h sumf wvrse than inadiquat; for wi cannot
forget zhat zhife objects are of zhe sort Mfli aravfe hif
anger and contempt inYanityVair; and zho' it my bi only
an artistic avkwardniss, yet zhis preference for Hernal
vanitief abvve temporal wvnf if vncvmfor table, andnnd'
hssly fhrowf a nasty suspicion on hif whole shme.*

*mnyan'f dhuf merit, bis^de -die gift zhat I hav a/lredy
preifd, if hif profe style, which if admird bi all whoo
prifer zhe force of plein spudh tu zhe divicis of rhetoric.
I mid discrete it no forther than tu sty that it if af direct
af possible, and well svsteirid. Hi seldom usis eny but
zhe simphstwvrdf and dictionτὰ ἐπιτυχόντα ὀνόματα,
and hi makes ytse of hif opporrtwitiief for colloquial w
presionf. Hi tellf vs svmuftiere zhat hi cud hav com'
mandid a more ornamental style had hi prifer d it, and
an ixamination of hif style thud istablth or dimoltih*

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

the truth of zhis assertion, Havin myself red only his pilgrim's Progress and Grace Abounding, I am not iquiptfor die task; bvt m[impresion if diat hi cud not hav dvne well in eny vdier manner. The clvmsimss of hif verse done sitmf tujvstify zhis opinion, and dier if anvzher general consideration, tMdi follow; from die necessity of explenir hov a man so little educated thud hav svrpasst a//l bvt die very best wqterf; for of zhis, vMih if generally conside/d a wvnder, dixer if a simple account. Hif imagination, sincerity, and single pvrpos wer af likely tu bi found in hif station af in eny vzher, and given ditfe, and given also hif habit of using languag in its hitst intention, thatt if tu sertfhfor truth and convey it convincityly tu harerf bi wvrd ofmavih, dien die fact zhat fa kmw only wvn book, die Bible, and kmw thatt bi hart is ixactly what was riquir's ty sacve him from the mistakes intu which erudition with its dis tractin knolidg of good and bad injvkolces all writers ixcept die born artist. And if this simple account of his svccess bi die true wvn, it negativf die probability diat fa cud ttqually hav master d die more daborat excel' lenaf, the Λόγοι κεκαλλιετημένοι καὶ κεκοσμημένοι. Thofe whoo most admire hif style my well admit diat it if capable of more biwty zhan fa haf put intu it, hif

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

greittst biwtie; of diction biity manly transqb'd from the Bible, and hi original biwtie; brity thufiy in die wy of suggestion, ufhere the sincerity and depth of hi; religivs motion tavht him an eloquent and truly artistic riiirve. Buit ther are meny indication;, moreover, that hi; artistic sense was nicher acute nor profound. Hi; manner of namin hi; personagt; bi di; adjutiv which predicates their characteristic quality, fyke tie dramatis personae of Congreve; ply;, dio' ofn more than justified, i; pusht tu quite an vgly ixcess, and that a Mr. Wiseman hud narrate a loty history of a Mr. Badman, and bi harkend tu bi a Mr. Attentive, i; not a mastery of narrativ dicice Such name; are more of'n tudivs than amusin; they suggest a commonplace lack ofrisorce, and also a certan priggiflintss and self complacency in the writer; an oh jection diat eny won my fid and uftiidh critici;m can explein, fior this wy of namity character; i; of die natjir of conudy, and riqupef that die character; Jhud h tmtid kindly, in a trnti; on ethic; Mere vya; are surname; zhvs handled, die person; are abstraction;, and yco my bi a; hard vpon diem a; yco wil; but if yco attafli a vicivs name tu dii actor in a story yco are bound tu tmt him good humor'dly and let him off; else yoo are guilty of havin first dfamd him and dien of judgin him after, if

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

zhi actor in a story if tu bi condemn d bi die ruder hi shud not bi openly pnjvdgd bi zhe writer; and likewise, if riiders are tu admire him, their admiration shud not bi pri'ingagd. And wherever zhi avfhor diclaref hif intention hi wil divertjvdgment nweyfrom thi actor on tu himself. Bunyanf puple are nizher abstractions nor human biins; and this condition my bi tu svme ixtent issential tu zhecharacterf in an alligory. I shud bi sorry tu dogmatfce about alligorical art; wvn consideration, haw ever, sum? persuafiv tu mi, and zhatt if zhat zhe limita' tionf of human knolidg suggest zῆλονοια {hud bi svbordinatid tu die story. Hire wud appiar zhe rial artistic opportunity, and zhe nifon for die form. Bun' yanf selfSicyirity of opinion led him tu die contrary method: I shudjvde zhat error of prifymption led him intu error? of art, and zhat zherefor Macaulay made anvzher of hif magnificent blvnderf ufhen hi stpFd him 'best of all allegorists, as Demosthenes was best of all orators'. A large part ofzhi approval zhat Bunyan haf hire wvn haf bun pvrdiast, fyke most popular svecessif in art, bi a niglect of propritief which are less istumd bi die pvblic zhan die novel iffects that can bi obeind bi zheir contravention.¹

¹ *The best told alligory in the world is (in mi opinion) St. Luke's*

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

It if pleanter tu wqte about mnyan wizhaut refer'ence tu hif (hiology, tho' won if temptid tu contrast him with zhatt (hvrv'goin) gospiller of our own dty, Count Leo Tolstoi, mnyan himself wud hav bun horrified tu fynd that die sucnt ofhiffame was literary excellence, yet without zhatt hi wud hav periM loty ago. in this rigard hif book if tyke Miltonf Epic, Mdh was at first estumd for its plot and Etiological aspect, and if new red in spfte of diem. Havity found so mvdifavlt, I shall not bi reckon d an extravagant admirer of mnyan, and i wrote uftiat I hav written in justification of a moderat admiration. Had hi bun af vnsparityly dicqd af hi haf bun ixtoll'd, I miht hav taken zfu vther syde. Over' preife wil dco hif reputation no service; and hif (hiology nudf so mvdh allowance that enyfhin) uflnidh dislocates him from hif t[me dves him vast injvry; and this syde of hif warmist frendf doo not perceve, uflien they Victorianise hif spellin) and parade hif Calvinism on tyny paper.

story of die Prodigal Son. H sums tu hav nsily won die first place bi an absolutely faiths puce ofwvrk.

XVIII

SIR THOMAS BROWNE

FIRST PRINTED
as 'The Causerie of the Week'
in 'The Speaker'
14 May 1904

[On p. 139 a small alteration, made
later by the author, is here incorporated.]

XVIII

SIR THOMAS BROWNE¹

TRACING *die growth of fruthavht in England durin die seventunflt century, Buckle—in hi interesting History of civilization—puts forward sir Thomas Browne as a prominent landmark, 'a curious instance of the rapid progress which the English mind was making in casting off superstition. His Religio Medici, written abovt 1634—diatt if, well bifore the civil war—shows (hi says) 'a credulity that must have secured the sympathy of the then dominant classes'; while in his next book, die Pseudodoxia, or 'inquiry into Vulgar Errors', which was publisht in 1646, 'there is displayed a spirit so entirely different that if it were not for the most decisive evidence we could hardly believe it to have been written by the same man. ... The truth is, how ever, that during the twelve years which elapsed between the two works there was completed that vast social and intellectual revolution which', &c., and, takity die doctor as his text, hi delates for some pages on hif instrvctiv conversion from superstition tu science.*

¹ The Works of Sir Thomas Browne. Edited by Charles Sayle. Vol. I. London: Grant Richards. 8s. 6d. net.

SIR THOMAS BROWNE

The wirde ocian of Buckle's lernin is usually limpid, and the happy voyager on its hallow waters my su the hottom; but in this case thi obstacle if a dutal ufhipli hi if likely tu overlook—a strange error Mdh can best bi accwntid for bi svppofity that Buckle waf hire tqvm' fantly mlarginj vpon svm old record of a hasty im' presion. For ixamination of the twco books dvef not jvstifi hif assertion. Doctor Thomas Browne waf a mass of superstition, and hif Religio Medici brin concern d wich riligion, offer'd, it if true, obvndant examplef of it tu the skeptic's nger ie; but it if a man caracteristic of thatt book that it if thi ovtspoken opinionf of a leyman on a svbjct on which privat opinion waf forbidden, uavever orthodox its general concliyionf, die method if thatt offnifhavht, and the qht tufrufhavht if practice ally assyim'd; and it waf thif that ca'll'd attention tu it and adid its svccess. Hence vrotistants davtid ufliether its lyicyibrationfwer thofe of a Quaker or of a Papist; Salmasius wud not recommend it tu aforin pvblisher on account of its 'exorbitant conceptions in religion, die Catholic Digby complein'd of thi 'ayrienesse of the fancy', and the Pope put it on thi index; bvt on thi vther hand die later book, the Pseudodoxia, which Buckle so preifif, this, uflifte itpntendf tu bi scientific, if lodid with

SIR THOMAS BROWNE

thiiological lumber and disgraced bi onscientific method; and, dio die dchoice of subject my probably bi ascrtffd tu achange in thi intillectual atmosfere indeed i doo not dovt that it wa ksuggested tu Brkowne bi thi openin pages of the Discours de la Methode which had appiar'd in 1637, and that it reprsents hi? foolish idin of what Descartes mint bi gettity rid of false notions—yet the book riviils thi avihor tu h a more syiperstitivs and inept thinker than eny wvn wud havgesstfrom his erlier work; in which the subject was mystical and the fancy more allowable. I shud myself sey that if the scientific inquiry had bun the first book and the Religio the second, Mr. Buckle'? contention wud hav bun a? tunable.

The Religio and part of the Inquiry constitute the first instalment of a new idition of sir Thomas Browne's works new brin pvblisht bi Mr. Grant Richards, widi Mr. Charles Saylefor editor; and if eny po?essor of the first volume shud with tu rud die Pseudodoxia, it i? pos' sible that the question hire mootid my svppty him widi an interest ufhitfh hi miht vtherwise lack tu carry him thru. Bvtin case hi shud still, as is likely, bi diterr'd bi the follies of Adam and Eve and die drintss of die lod' stone, I wud recommend him bi no miins tu omit die perusal of die disquisitions on pages 308 tu 321, as tu

SIR THOMAS BROWNE

whether elifants hav joints in their limbs and whether doves hav gall bladders. thise (and hi may find others) are inimitable gem} of fatuity well worthy tu bi riprintid; and, as Dr. Browne so seldom provides his ruder with eny occason for merriment, they shud not bi niglectid.

And tu torn Buckle's reflection abovt, it if a matter for wonder diat a man whoo wrote chose chapters shud hav produced a book which want the round of Europe and is new recognis'd as an English classic. the fact has ty bi accovntidfor; and nimemberin what thi avthor tells us that hi wrote ot when hi was at thi end of his twenties and for his own delectation, won my assume this iffi dent cavis tu hav been somthin of this kind; First a stron literary ambition which was enthrall'd bi thi example of Montaigne; secondly, a wide miscrtlanivs redin and studius habits, which so far fitted him for imitatin his model; and, thirdly, a happy moment of yon inthusias tu kindle rhetoric, a moment in which all bis expeerience and knolidg alike sum'd tu groop consistently intu a satisfi in viw of life and morals, vividly appiarin and ugerly embraced -such a vison as all yon thinkers hav known, a hevenly inspiration full of drum buwty, a spiritual revilationm on the mavntan top of filosophy, a convincement which seems iternal but

SIR THOMAS BROWNE

which vanishies again as quickly as it came, 'melting into air, into thin air. One need not ask hau lon the vison lastid with the yon doctor, hau much hi ritein'd of it, or hav far his svbsiquent presentations of it wer due tu habit, tu memory, or tu mm literary vanity; it if evident zhat his book was thi avtcom of some such inthusiasm and that it is tu the conviction which inspir'd its rhetoric that it owes its vitality.

For mi part, tho' I can admire it, I hav never fovnd it rudable ixcept pucemul. Ther are good thavhts,fyne frasis, and, as I sed, a warmth of inthyisiasm; yet som thity holds wvn off, and it dvs not giv mi 'the genuin plesur wizh which I rud Montaigne. The fact if that the role of pedant a la cavaliere dus not sut Browne; it if nothing without gaity and Browne is triste at liist he is very triste tu mi. I grant that it if impossible tu dis' intangle a warm and kindly humor merely from ima' gxnativ wit, hcayfe some intillects wil bi warm'd bi the mire ticklin of wit, if it only bi sharp inof; the prick' lin simulates hut—as a dri skin mey take a plesurable sensation from a stinin nettle; and hyimvr, as wi call it, most pleinely hav different bovndnrief tu different minds But thatt warm'hartid contentment of a surivs intillect fully sympathetic wizh human natur, zhe

SIR THOMAS BROWNE

communication of which is the rial dharm and only tryie svccess ofsvdi an attempt a? Browne made, if absent from his rhetoric. It if zhepofesion ofzhis quality, which tho' ixhibitid bi rhetoric mvst bi rootid in the sol, that makes Montaigne book so attractiv tu men and so annoyin tu filosofers, whoo lament tu su rhetoric tri umfin usily where ruson stombles and even in Monin Mon' taigne the pedantry and egotism bicomme at last wiarisom, andjvst af wvn page of Browne if invfat a t[me, so wvn or twoo essay of zhe Maire of Bordeaux ask for an inter' vol. And yet zhe Frenchman if quite svccessful, zhe plefvr that hi givs if rial and abirdin, and won ritorns tu him, after the necissary intervalf, agein and agein thru out Itfe. Moreover, not only if Browne'f temper of a corser sort and hif matter clvmfier and less varyd, bvt hif art if difident; it if almost always too palpable, sometime even tu a svspidon of insincerity, and occa' fonally zhi ornament of a sentence wrotyf zhejvstmss of a fancy. Hi was at bottom a syiperstitivs, hard natur, with crvstid sympafhief; and it if, alas I ricordid of him that in his sixtiiah year hi gave expert evidence in the trial of twoo miferable wiminfor witchcraft, and that thru his pitiful psiudodoxy they wer convictid of brin in lug with the devil New ufliat wud Mr. Buckle hav sed tu thatt?

SIR THOMAS BROWNE

The Religio Medici has a curbs history. The book was written about 1635, and Browne tells us that it was not intended for the press, but circulated in MS. among his friends.. in 1642 two surreptitious editions of it from a publisher appeared; and in 1643 an author's edition, with a preface by the author which has ever since been printed with it, disclaiming the spurious edition and any animadversions that it might call forth.

There is no reason to doubt Browne's statements. That the book circulated in MS. five or six copies are extant to witness; and we may have had nothing actively to do with the first issue. But we must not believe we that he meant exactly what he said, any more than Montaigne did, often in the preface to his first Essay he protested that they were intended for his friends. Such an attitude of the natural reserve of good manners in the delivery of personal confession which pride would not offer to those who would take them amiss: and both were no doubt honestly gratified by their mutual welcome: and if the book followed Browne had intended for select reading had to be disclaimed and recast for the public when it could no longer be withheld from them, then we should expect to find important alterations in the acknowledged version. But, as a matter of fact, the new text appeared from the same publisher

SIR THOMAS BROWNE

with the same printing and frvntispuce, and tho' the correction? are pritty numerus they are of little or no importance, indeed it is tu be regretted that Browne did not take Thi opportunity of amendin himself ufhere hi had good occafon tu doo so. Ther if in hif book a passag on marrag which hi shud hav been asham written prifumably in 1635, and in 1641 hi marry'd n wife whoo bravht him twelve Children and svrvivd him. New if Browne in 1635 spoke from experience, thatt very experience incapacitated him from spukin at all, at lust af n tit flier; and if withavt experience, tlien hif marrag shud hav tavht him better, it if an insvjferable irreverence, an insvlt svfli af humanity svjferf more and more from literature; bvt it if perhaps a necessity of all mysterief that they fliud bi discvsst only bi thofe whoo are excluded from them—and hi at lust sparef vs thatt mire squabble of notionf ufhiflt most diltfit the vulgar.

That Browne did not virtually alter hif book mey in svme mefvr jvstify the prefont editor from not noticing thife facts. Bvt it wud hav bun well wvrth uflifte tu hav set hif ruderf at life vpon the matter, and it if tu bi hopd that in the final volume hi wil hav svm notes in ufhifli hi wil indvlge them with this and vther necissary information.

XIX

GEORGE SANTAYANA

FIRST PRINTED

London Mercury

August 1920

REPRINTED

The Dial

November 1920

XIX

GEORGE SANTAYANA

T H E title of this book, Little Essays,¹ if in wvn ri' spectjvst and descriptiv: eny wvn whoo haf a taste for fhort esseyf will find a good feest provided for him; the protnis of comprehensiv and balanced thavt if fulfil'd, while for craftsmanship in diction and stile, without which an essey if vnwvrthy of its name, this avthor my take rank amon our best writers. Bvt in anvther respect the title is diceptiv, and ariider may bi surpris'd tu find a comphte system of filosofy sprvn vpon him, convey'd with a skill quite remarkable in literary art; for tiffhte the esstyf can well hold their own as detach't disquisi'tions on special svbjects, key form a cateena of thavht which hans logically tugether, exposin a rational filosofy in a shme so carefully contqu'd that eeven the necessary definitionf of davtful termf—imagination, reefon, perception, and the like—are redily svppl'td without eny appearance of mafheenery as soon as the reeder beginf tu need them.

The book has, therefor, twoo cleims, literary and

¹ Little Essays. Drawn from the writings of George Santayana, by Logan pearsall Smith. (Constable, 12s. 61)

GEORGE SANTAYANA

flosafaal; and, as it my bi gesst from die preface that it waf the literary ehment that fast gave occa' sion for pvblicationtij so this wil h perhaps the fast tu attract attention: for vldid thi erlier flosoferf of the English sccol wer pvnctilivs scqbef and proud of their pen?, and most of diem master; in their manner, their tradition has bun ill manteind, so that, in spite of svm brilliant ixceptionf, wi are not nov accvstomd tu look for uven complacent dignity or severity of style in aflosafa trutif, mvfli less tu ixpect a profe which if dtlphthfulfor its own sake, mdud it has bun sed that George Santayana haf imperill'd the recog' nition of hiffilosofy bi die fine robes in which hi has consistently prifentid it; and that his ruderf hav bun distracted from the sincerity and depth of hif pvrpos bp the perpetual flow of hif eloquence, hif ridh vocabulary, and the plegant cadencif of hif sentence, with their abovndin) imigery, incisiv epigramf, and jovial humvr. Epigram and humvr are indud dangervs tcolf; bvt hav shud an honist flosofer forgo hyimvr? Humvr, af it sumf tu nu, if die natural cortisy Mflipasst htwun avr instinct and our rufon. The consivs and svbconsivs mind are like twco men of different nationalitief whoo hav lon lodgd tugether in die same havse, and from not

GEORGE SANTAYANA

*knowing eedh vther'f speeih hav been reduced tu expressiq
their sympathy and goodwill bi bavin and smlin tueedh
vther on the steirf. They mutually recognite that they
understand the avkwardness of the situation, and riiey
good'hymvr'dly moke the best of it: as our avfhor svm'
ufliere styf, A well-bred instinct meets reason half-way';
and if it if enyihin fyke this, hav can riieir own recog'
nition oftheir own statvs h denid its place in an honest
treetment of human Itfe? Becavfe it if pleyful perhaps or
too amyifin , andfilosofic seerivsnest notfeelin quite iure
of its pretentivs dignity cannot ventytr mar a joke. And
it if true that, af ther are occa}onf uthitti forbid tri
flin , ther are also thinkers so incapable of levity of any
sort that they cannot loff withavt difonmin themselves.
William Cowper was as convinced of sin af St. Vul was,
and confessedly far more despondent of salvation than he;
bvt ifamvn tlie afhentic mneinf of the Aposlef writins
a ballad in the manner of John Gilpin had cvme down
tu vs, ufliat hud we think of his Epistle to the Gala'
tians? I hav not detected Mr. Santayana in abjifin hif
hyimvr: he exercyef it ~~cheerly~~ when deelin with bar'
barifm and vulgarity, or in explodin thefallacief (af he
holds them tu be of those scools of fhavht tu which he
if essentially oppos'd, or, agein, on those rare occafonf*

GEORGE SANTAYANA

uften hi rilaxif tu spuk of himself. No wvn rudiri hif account of Kant wud wtih that hi had Jhiith'd hif satiric weponf,for on thatt topic hi if qufte a? amyifift as Heine. Hi dves not fill kindly tuwards dialectical systims, and stys symufliere that svdh filosoferf doo not procud af honist serdherf after tryifh wud, hvt tnvdi rather fyke lavyerf whco labvr tu make tfie best of a case tu which they are profesionally committed. Tu mi svdi flosoref hav sumd tyke the sccolboyf definition of a net /A lot of holes tied together with string, whatever mey hi fhavht of Mr. Santayanaf meshif, it mvst hi grantid that hi} strity if afyne silk. Hire if an example:

'since the ideal has this perpetual pertinence to mortal struggles, he who lives in the ideal and leaves it expressed in society or in art enjoys a double immortality. The eternal has absorbed him while he lived, and when he is dead his influence brings others to the same absorption, making them, through that ideal identity with the best in him, reincarnations and perennial seats of all in him which he could rationally hope to rescue from destruction. He can say, without any subterfuge or desire to delude himself, that he shall not

GEORGE SANTAYANA

wholly die; for he will have a better notion than the vulgar of what constitutes his being. By becoming the spectator and confessor of his own death and of universal mutation, he will have identified himself with what is spiritual in all spirits and masterful in all apprehension; and so conceiving himself, he may truly feel and know that he is eternal!—Page 106.

\n rudin this extract it riquires svme attention tu dis'pel thi impresion that wi are dality with a platonist; in' dud, for the manner and the vocabulary it miht bi a translation of svm passag in the Socratic dialogs; bvt tdiat ever inspiration thi avfhor my owe tu vlatofor his particular doctrin of bdiat, hi recognizis Spinoza and Democritus for hi } immudiat master }, and his filosofy miht perhaps h discqb'd a a bildin vp of idialism—thatt is, the supremacy of da imagination—on a naturalistic or materialistic basis. Mr. Santayana takes man a } hi 'is known tu bifrom ob } ervation and expurience, acceptin all that is convincin in skepticism, and all that h dams prooven in nuncanical fy } ics; and this my bi call'd n basis of 'common sense': and in thvs rinovncirn what is termd 'Epistemology' hi incvrs the riproch of matnrrialism. Hav far hi wud himself accept

GEORGE SANTAYANA

and nllow this description of hif ihavht mvst bi jvdgd from hif own statements in thefiffti and last divifon of this book, uftiidh if intitl'd On Materialism and Morals. And materialism if a questionable label: if the wvrd 'matter' had diangd its form af much af it has diangd its connotation, not all the Grimmf of Germany cud ever hav discvver'd lavs tnvf tu mable afilologist tu identify it

with this rfinance on common sense the riddle of consivsnts givs our avfhor no trvble:

'nothing is more natural than that animals should feel and think. The relation of mind to body, of reason to nature, seems to be actually this: when bodies have reached a certain complexity and vital equilibrium, a sense begins to inhabit them which is focussed upon the preservation of that body and on its reproduction. To separate things so closely bound together as are mind and body, reason and nature, is a violent and artificial divorce, and a man of judgment will instinctively discredit any philosophy in which it is decreed.'—Page 15.

Riison, which follows consivsnts vpon the seme, har' motizis the varivs instincts and impvlstf, and istablisht

GEORGE SANTAYANA

an ideal of good—that if, it corrects instinct by experience 'with a view to attaining the greatest satisfaction of which our nature is capable' (page 121 . it is 'essentially subsidiary' (page 179 in the service of a finite organisation (page 226 , and it becomes 'the ultimate conscience (page 243 .

There is, perhaps, the same difficulty in Santayana as in Spinoza of reconciling the religious attitude with the metaphysical or philosophical tenets. In both of them Christ is the wisdom of God and also merely a supreme offspring of human imagination: and for many a like notion the later philosopher sums up in the phrase that the papal Curia is no better treatment than Spinoza got from the Synagogue. I have been confidentially informed that within the Roman Church (to quote an avowed author of allgiance and freedom of (having if all around it its members, but not the promulgation of it is there is still space for another name on the index librorum expurgatorum, I should judge that Professor Santayana has qualified for whatever distinction it may yet confer, I was myself much comforted in so to speak opinion so similar to my own so frankly advocating by a son of the Church; hence since I edited the poems of Digby Dolben and Gerard Hopkins I have been assured by the animadversion of

GEORGE SANTAYANA

of Roman Catholic jornal. 'Bridges etait deja tres eloigne du christianisme' is; a frafe Mdh still echoef in mi household. I waffrphtend tu su mi df fencehs name pvrSyid bi svdh a thick arrowy fliht of accents grave and acute; and thatt little amater excom' mjinication waf bvt the best plvm in a good pp. Bvt I was perplext when thi vdier dey an eminent English writer riprodht miforblin so blindly divotid tu christu anity af tu bi vnable tu sympathite with other riligionf; and hi held vp for mi example mp twco greit pwdices' sorf in office, Wordsworth and Tennyson, whoo (so hi assertid wer not christian?, tres eloignes du Christie anisme; and this gentleman's viw waf, I take it, the same with thatt of anvdiel writer—whcom I as hihly istumfor hif talent af I pity him for the misfortw hfell intu ufhen hi contractid tu wqte mp 'life withavt liven eny acquaintance wirti its mugre maturialf—whoo de scriedmi, I biluve, af a child of thi English preyer Book: while only thi vdier dey an American professor agein vpbreidid mi for mp 'incredible parochialism of outlook'; af if because a man wud strein ovt a pope hi most swallow a Rifornd chvrdis! I wittiqly fildh an indh or twoo of mi allottid space in this prnal tu make a pvblic acknolidgment of gratitude tu mp mentorf.

GEORGE SANTAYANA

*of riligion, ahavt which ther if much in thtfe essays
Santayana has this eloquent vindication:*

'There must needs be something humane and necessary in an influence that has become the most general sanction of virtue, the chief occasion for art and philosophy, and the source, perhaps, of the best human happiness.'—Page 47.

Hifflosofical examination of Christianity if full, and hifvef not profess feifh in its universal acceptance:

'The sciences are necessarily allies, but religions, like languages, are necessarily rivals, what religion a man shall have is a historical accident, quite as much as what language he shall speak. . . . The attempt to speak without speaking any particular language is not more hopeless than the attempt to have a religion that shall be no religion in particular. A courier's or a dragomans speech. . . . So travellers from one religion to another, people who have lost their spiritual nationality, may often retain a neutral and confused residuum of belief, which they may egregiously regard as the essence of all religion, so little may they remember the graciousness and naturalness of that

GEORGE SANTAYANA

ancestral accent which a perfect religion should have/
—Page 48.

*in hif essey on vrotistantifm hi seys meny shriwd and
some vmxpectid thirs of it:*

*Protestantism has the unmistakable character of a
genuine religion. . . . It is in correspondence with
the actual ideals and instincts of the believer.'—*
Page 82.

*it is a religion of pure spontaneity, of emotional
freedom, deeply respecting itself, but scarcely dc
cipherring its purposes. ... It mistakes vitality, both
in itself and in the universe, for spiritual life.'—*
Page 80.

*Hi sums tu ihink its connection with Christianity tu bi
accidental: it if a purely Teutonic prodvct; and, as hi
never Shrinks from his concfafonf:*

*This underlying Teutonic mood, which we must
call Protestantism for lack of a better name, is anterior
to Christianity and can survive it!*

*His contrast bitwun the spirit of protistantism and the
spirit of die Gospd if vncompromfcin andaf disconcertin*

GEORGE SANTAYANA

as Mr. Barlow's (thatt if, Mr. Day'? haraq in Sand' ford and Merton; bvt uflten he speaks of theflosophy of modern Germany as a development, a very flawer of Vrotestantifm, we feel that he if assjimity too svmmarily what the essence of thefe 'ideas' really if, and we wud dis' allov his major premiss. won miht assert, per contra, that Protestant "London in the nineteenth century was more essentially christian than Catholic Rome was in the fifteenth; and are ther not hvndredf of thausands, ney, millionf of Protestants in England and Germany, tu sey nvthity of America, whoo hav held, in the mem, tu the Gospel and tu christian life withavt danger of eny teint from this Teutonic filosofy? Agein, irfhen he seys that Protestantifm navadays 'bids fair to apply itself to social life', my not thatt be an essential frut of the Gospel? It if conceivable that time my yet show that thise men—tres eloignes du christianisme, af he holdf them tu be, and its possible svrvivors—these very men wer the carrierf of it And when they would have thrust him down from the hill whereon their city was built, he escaped out of their hands.

This essey endf with a brilliant dictvm ufhidh soms vp wvn aspect of the Reformation unforgettablely:

GEORGE SANTAYANA

'The symptoms have been cured and the disease driven in!

Hi does not feil tu point out that Christianity was an Oriental 'idea, and was not naturaliz'd in Europe without a considerable dilution of paganism; and this because

'The Oriental mind has no middle, it oscillates between extremes, and passes directly from sense to mysticism and back again!

Hav well this ixpresion illuminates avr npvgnance tuwardf die forms in which Oriental art has figvr'd the gods of Indian mythology I It if a good example of the plefvr which Ms author can giv. Svch dicta and afor' isms are on every page, and yet they never croud:

'if pain could have cured us, we should long ago have been saved!

'That life is worth living is the most necessary of assumptions, and were it not assumed, the most im' possible of conclusions!

Tu set svdi fhins tugether joslin in a row if tu take the freshnis ovt of them. They flow from the writer just where they hav full force:

GEORGE SANTAYANA

'plasticity loves new moulds because it can fill them, but for a man of sluggish mind and bad manners there is no place like home!

For an example of his stedy pacis, a section from The Knowledge of character my bi taken, it givs inc'u dentally his estimat of Rousseau:

'if Rousseau, for instance, after writing those Confessions in which candour and ignorance of self are equally conspicuous, had heard some intelligent friend like Hume draw up in a few words an account of their author's true and contemptible character, he would have been loud in protestations that no such ignoble characteristics existed in his eloquent consciousness; and they might not have existed there, because his consciousness was a histrionic thing, and as imperfect an expression of his own nature as of man's, when the mind is irrational no practical purpose is served by stopping to understand it, because such a mind is irrelevant to practice, and the principles that guide the man's practice can be as well understood by eliminating his mind altogether. So a wise governor ignores his subjects' religion or concerns himself only with its economic and temperamental aspects; if the real

GEORGE SANTAYANA

forces that control life are understood, the symbols that represent those forces in the mind may be disregarded. But such a government, like that of the British in India, is more practical than sympathetic, while wise men may endure it for the sake of their material interests, they will never love it for itself. There is nothing sweeter than to be sympathised with, while nothing requires a rarer intellectual heroism than willingness to see ones equation written out!

Sixty pages are devoted to Religion and forty for Art that is, aesthetics or the fine arts and Poetry; then follow sixty pages on Poets and philosophers, in which religion again comes in for a good deal of handling; and its prominence in the book is duly accounted for by its prominence here.

A system of philosophy which sets out to establish a high spiritual ideal of life on the basis of the motions will take its most persuasive support from the idea of art; whence the section on Art (that is, aesthetic must be of primary importance, in the wider sense of the term with such that religion, morals, and aesthetics are, all of them, branches of Art—(it is to be wished that journalists would give over using the word Art for painting; it is

GEORGE SANTAYANA

*slaty —and tho' the Aristotelian supremacy of politics
if acknoledgd, ther if in this book comparatively little dis'
cvision of its scientific brandhef; or I shud sey that mi
reedyty gave me the impresion that social development
was defend in svbordination tu individual perfection.*

*The esthetic section I shall reprezent bi typical quo'
tations, which wil be better than eny attempted som'
mary: bvt I confess that this method if also the resorce
of despeir, for ike svbjct if overwhelmin, and eny wvn
of these seventeen little esstys wud provide svfficient
matter for a whole review: but I my ventur a few
remarks.*

*Morals, so Mr. Santayana holdf, requiref only the
harmony of uch Ife, and thatt harmony if the same af
happines and wisdom. Aesthetic has tu be limited bi
prudence or utility in die interests of happines: thvs the
fine arts are superficial superadded activities' (page 122 .*

*Accordingly af this harmony if induced in a man he
wil clarify his pdeal, and mey eeven cvme tu a vison of
perfection. Svdl moments of inspiration are the sorce of
the arts', and a work of art if the monument of such a
moment (pages 125, 129 .*

*And here we are svddenly confrvnted bi an essay
entitled stars, whi is this? it wud seem that, thi 'ideal'*

GEORGE SANTAYANA

havin bun rifolvd intu a balance of relativitief, it if neassary tu look abravdfor some more stable foundation, and it if askt whether the biwty of the starry hevns haf not a sensyivs carncter which if subtyme in itself (page 127 : and so the next essty if on Music, bicause music mokes ixcvrsionf intu vltra mondane riigionf, and rivülsdelicncief off fillin which in ordinary life are not isolated or perciiv'd, and, in giving them definitform, my bi sed tu create them, and thus, like the stars, proovef that somthin non relative is very near the heart' (page 135 . it if possible that the silectid essays are not wholly explicit at this point:

'That art is prima facie and in itself a good can not be doubted, it is a spontaneous activity, and that settles the question, in the actual disarray of human life and desire, wisdom consists in knowing what goods to sacrifice and what simples to pour into the supreme mixture. The extent to which aesthetic values are allowed to colour the resultant of highest good is a point of great theoretic importance not only for art but for general philosophy!—Page m.

'beauty gives men the best hint of ultimate good which their experience as yet can offer; and the most

GEORGE SANTAYANA

lauded geniuses have been poets, as if people felt that those seers, rather than men of action or thought, had lived ideally and known what was worth knowing. That such should be the case, if the fact be admitted, would indeed prove the rudimentary state of human civilisation. The truly comprehensive life should be the statesman's!—Page 113.

'when we consider further the senseless rivalries, the vanities, the ignominy that reign in the "practical" world, how doubly blessed it becomes to find a sphere where limitation is an excellence, where diversity is a beauty, and where every man's ambition is consistent with every other man's and even favourable to it!—Page 114.

'Art supplies constantly to contemplation what nature seldom affords in concrete experience—the union of life and peace!—Page 115.

'To criticise art on moral grounds is to pay it a high compliment by assuming that it aims to be adequate, and is addressed to a comprehensive mind. The only way in which art could disallow such criticism would be to protest its irresponsible infancy, and admit that it was a more or less amiable blatancy in individuals, and not art at all!—Page 117.

GEORGE SANTAYANA

The value of art lies in the making people happy.
—Page 119.

'If Sybaris is so sad a name to the memory—and who is without some Sybaris of his own—if the image of it is so tormenting and in the end so disgusting, this is not because we no longer think its marbles bright, its fountains cool, its athletes strong, or its roses fragrant; but because, mingled with all these supreme beauties there is the ubiquitous shade of Nemesis, the sense of a vacant will and a suicidal inhumanity. The intolerableness of this moral condition poisons the beauty which continues to be felt'—Page 120.

'Nothing but the good of life enters into the texture of the beautiful.'—Page 123.

'NO atheism is so terrible as the absence of an ultimate ideal, nor could any failure of power be more contrary to human nature than the failure of moral imagination, or more incompatible with healthy life. For we have faculties, and habits, and impulses. These are the basis of our demands. And these demands, although variable, constitute an ever-present intrinsic standard of value by which we feel and judge. The ideal is immanent in them; for the ideal means that environment in which our faculties would find

GEORGE SANTAYANA

their freest employment and their most congenial world.'—Page 124.

Such sound and convincin tiidhin if much nudid. Hire are afiw extracts from thi issyi on Literature:

'To turn events into ideas is the function of literature. . . .it looks at natural things with an incorrigibly dramatic eye, turning them into permanent unities (which they never are and almost into per'sons, grouping them by their imaginative or moral affinities and retaining in them chiefly what is incidental to their being, namely, the part they may chance to play in mans adventures.'—Page 138.

*'It comes to clarify the real world, not to encumber it . . . it can not long forget, without forfeiting all dignity, that it serves a burdened and perplexed creature, a human animal struggling to persuade the universal Sphinx to propose a more intelligible riddle —*Page 139.

*'Our logical thoughts dominate experience only as the parallels and meridians make a checkerboard of the sea. They guide our voyage without controlling the waves, which toss for ever in spite of our ability to ride over them to our chosen ends —*Page 148.

GEORGE SANTAYANA

'TO the art of working well a civilited race would add the art of playing well!—Page 154.

*The next section of die book if on Poets and philcv
sophers, and tu meny ruder} it if likely tu h die most
attractiv, for thi estimtits are pleinspoken and very
pointtd widi dieir ixact diction and ixvltnnt hyimvr.
Admirerf of Robert drowning wil h dispstid; on thi
vther hand, bverf of Dante shud bi satisfbdjor hi if set
on a hih pedtstal. Mr. Santayana (kinks that Lucretius
and Dante took die qht viw of a port's fvnction. Pro
fessor Royce wvnce told mi, vken talkin of the position
of filosofy in America, diat die function of a flosofer
was so understood there that hi found that hi was
ixpectid 'to emotionalite the district', it if Mr. Santa'
yana'f opinion that it if die function of poitry tu imo'
tionnlize flosofy; and that the greit pom must bi thi
isfheticnl exposition of a comphte thuory of human life,
so far af thatt if vnderstood; and that ther if therefor at
prefent a finer opportunity for a greit poit than the
world has hidiertu offer'd.*

*since Dante'f viw of die situation if novadyf ex'
plodid, and indud was alredy svmufhat old'faMorid in
his own dy, it wud follow—dio Mr. Santayana dvef*

GEORGE SANTAYANA

not sty so—that hifpoim mvst nav bi obsoltte: bvt I cud not think that Iam less inthrall'd bi his poitry than his first hiarers wer; I shud sy that 'its loveliness increases'. And, agein, Paradise Lost, ufhen it was new, was ad' mir'd for its justification of the ways of God tu man, and yet thi admiration of thopefirst admirers if far transcended of avr own, alcho wi set bi its argument af obsvrd, and love the poitry in spite of it—vnless it shud bi true that the poitry geins bi its romantic abstraction from thi actual accidents of present conditions: whence I shud con' clude that poitry wil use filosofy rather than bi us'd bi it. But such a poem as Mr. Santayana disires and fore tells, if ever it shud bi written, wil necessarily bi written bi a greitpoit, and hi wil wqte good poetry.

From thise subjects wi pass tu the final section of the book, hedid Materialism and Morals, and whatever summary thi avthor allaus vs of his systim my bi lookt for hire.

\t wud bi prisumptuos in mi tu attempt tu criticize professor Santayana's filosofy, and mi ruders wil prob ably riioice with mi that I cannot undertake it; but I can avavdh that hi? systim jvstifies itself pragmatically as a vuhicle for lucid discorse; and if thins are tu bi jodg'd, as hi wud hav them, bi their human values, this book

GEORGE SANTAYANA

shud go far tu accredit it; for the lucidity with which the spiritual interests of lift art handled in thise ~~essays~~ can not usily be rivall'd: certainly I know of no other book in which ther if so much tuchin of thins that English puple need tu lern, nor where the tuchuin is so genial persuasiv, and perspicuvs, and so fru from the favs of fashionable prejudice and false sentiment, The flosophy, as I understand it, if very consonant with mi own thauht: ther if no pritence of hidin thi unsolv'd riddle of life. The sfinx Iorks in all systims; different scools only hosle her from pillar tu post, and if shi if tu bi driven intu eny corner where her prefence if obvivs, her best refuge if in thi unsenfshable atom. And this if an homster method than thatt of dismembering her andsuk' in tu hide her myitilaud fragments bi dispersal, as a piano tuner wil distribute thi error of his wulf all up and daun the scale: for whatever immatnriol agency ther my be, or nven shud wi come tu bi convinced that all vltimat agency waf immaturial, our minds wud bi unable tu concave of its mode of action except in material terms.

I rimember the story of a skipper, the old servant of a mercantile firm, whoo rispectid him af their most ex puiented and trustworthy agent. Hi was fond of horse

GEORGE SANTAYANA

Exereise, and whenever hi bravht his Ship intu port, which happen'd very frequently in chose days of Short col Storag, hi wud injoy a day's ridin and charge the hire of his hack on the Ship's bills. won dy when hi had prisented his accounts bifore the Bord some chiisparers objteted, and the chtirman was constrtin'd tu rimon' strate wich the captan and explain that the Bord re grettid that they had no authority tu svpli him with mounts at du expense of die Shareholders. The skipper bav'd tu cheir dicison, and at their next interviw was thankd and congratydatid on his prompt attntion tu their instrvctions, 'And we are glad tu see, Captain Davidson diat die horse no longer appiars in yor accounts', 'NO, gentlemen, ripli'd the skipper, 'hi. no longer appears , but, tho yoo myn't su him, hi's there.'

XX

THE GLAMOUR OF GRAMMAR

FIRST PRINTED
Times Literary Supplement
30 May 1912

XX

THE GLAMOUR OF GRAMMAR

WHEN, *eiht* years ago, Dr. Henry Bradley bravht out his masterly little textbook *The Making of English*, he workt vp tu the margin of a most interesting question which Iy beyond his skime. Thatt question is—Hav my the rise of new words, and of new meenins of words, be consider'd from a psichological point of viw? while the grammatical and etymological investigation fhowf only the lavs of their external forms, the psichological examination shud giv the intellectual and motional his tory of the puple. This branch of the science of languag has come tu be call'd semantics, or semasiology; and Mr. Pearsall Smith has nov written a book¹ the latter part of which is an attractiv popular introdvction tu *English Semantics*. In the first part of his book he is on the same gravnd with Dr. Bradley. . . . His method if, however, different; for, wheras Dr. Bradley took the actual accidence as data, and, showin haw its forms arose and vary'd, was able tu evolve the history from them, Mr. vearsall smith, on the other hand, takes ovr national history widi thi accustom'd dates and peeriods

¹ *The English Language*. By Logan Vearsall Smith. Home University Library of Modern Knowledge. (Williams and Norgate. is.net.).

THE GLAMOUR OF GRAMMAR

as his basis. This part of his work, tho' liven as a text book it most bi content tu hold a second place biside Dr. Bradley's, if written with greit life and literary skill, and a ltugether isapes the drinis and dulnis which usually pervade grammatical summaries. But for a sample of his stile wi wil giv an extract from the later and more original part of his work. Hi if spiikin of thi influx of religius words in the puriod from John tu Edward I, and hi writes thus:—

"The earlier of these represent Catholicism more in its formal and outward aspect; but shortly after the coming of the preaching friars to England, when the effects of the great religious revival of the Continent were brought home to the villagers and poor towns' folk, we find other words representing the inward and personal aspect of religious faith—devotion, pity, patience, comfort, anguish, conscience, purity, salvation. These words we may call, not perhaps too fantastically, "early Gothic" words, as their intro' duction coincides in date with the great churches, such as Salisbury Cathedral, and the great monastic houses, which were then being erected in what is called the "Early English" period of Gothic architecture!

THE GLAMOUR OF GRAMMAR

This is a model of text book writing. It is at once illuminating, attractive, and mnemonic; nor will the book disappoint those who judge it from this quotation.

Dr. Bradley, as every one knows, took a very optimistic view of our language, and we are glad to find that Mr. Pearsall Smith faithfully reproduces his attitude, because of respect for the language is the first condition of good practice. But in his praise of the 'group genitive' he seems to have misunderstood a passage in Dr. Bradley's book. The example there was 'The Duke of Devonshire's house', and such a group was pronounced to be 'a useful addition to the resources of the language', 'colloquially [adds Dr. Bradley] this practice is carried to quite grotesque extremes. We hear occasionally such sentences as "That was the man I met at Birmingham's idea" Now Mr. Pearsall Smith says—in colloquial speech we can even use a phrase such as "The man I saw yesterday's hat",' and he hopes the reader will imagine that this is sound colloquial English. It is, of course, a grotesque barbarity, productive only of absurdities and ambiguities; and these are the natural result of all kinds of neglect of grammatical construction. The colloquial omission of the relative pronoun, which is now so common even in our highest poetry and prose, needs to be warned against, for it tends

THE GLAMOUR OF GRAMMAR

tu make nonsense'groops of words. The simplification of our grammar, which thise writers so much belavd, has wongreit disadvantag—namely, that the identity of form in meny of our navns, verbs, and adjectivs, tuggedier with the absence of eny accidence tu determin grammatical relatione is apt tu moke nonsense groops, and it needs much attention and skill tu avoid the thise. This state of fhins is peculiar tu English, beirn consequent on the bosted peculiarity of our simplifi'd grammar; and if a fiilin for the languag shud inable vs tu avoid the thise avkwardnessis, yet a rule miht bi absolutely leid davn that no part of a sentence nor contiguvs parts of twoo consecutic sentence shud, if isolated from their context, make an ambiguity or nonsense bi the mselves. it seems tu us that ther if yet a dhancefor 'whom and for uther grammatical conveniences that the last generation has tri'd tu banish from common talk. it is an old obferva'tion in the history of words that exites return; low born or hih born, ther are meny patiently weitin their opportunity, like the democratic and oligarckical parties in the chies of ancient Greece; those whoom won revolution drives aut the next wil brin back; and they hav plenty of old frends at home redy tu welcom them. Mr. Vearsall Smith showsd hav the Romantic moovment

THE GLAMOUR OF GRAMMAR

reintroduced a number of what wi my call exil'd aris' tocrats; and just nov it is plainly the fashon tu ricall meny of thi other party. wi are inclind tu biliive that a very sliht gost of fashon miht rtstore tu awr spiich thi old vocalizd inflexion of the plural in such words as fist, wrist, frost, and post (and, if so, then meny less clamorvs outcasts with them), which wi nov incon' vimiently clip, and that wi miht come tu sey frostes and postes, as ovr gardeners du. Thise old forms, which are still prevalent amvty cvntrymen, are better words, both usier and actually shorter tu spuk dian thi onpw novnceable monosyllables that, havin taken their place, striw their cacofonies bravdcast over ovr best literatur. Only thi other dy wi met wich flames, in won of Mr. Masefeld's poems, if wi are not mistaken, and it gave vs onmitigatid plesvr. it ust tu bi volgarly suppos'd that ovr dialectal contry spiich was digradid; but nav that every child knows that it if mirely ancient it wil not bi so utterly scorn d. Nor can ovr distance from those older forms bi mesur'd bi time for—as Mr. Pearsall Smith seys.—

"we are probably now much nearer to chaucer, not only in our understanding of his age, but also in our

THE GLAMOUR OF GRAMMAR

comprehension of his language, than our ancestors were in Drydens time ... and Shakespeare and Spenser are much more easily comprehended by us than by the men of letters who were born not many years after the death of these great poets.'

Interesting and divertin af Etymology if, it if perhaps somthin of a literary fat tu make a truly riidable book out of matter that if so ditadht and miscdlantvs and apt tu rvn of intu blind all s. The tidivm which a mire cjazherity of isolated facts wil occasion appiirss in Mr. Weekley's niw book, The Romance of Words,¹ wherin hi has attempted tu groop what my bi calld the cnriosu ties of etymology. This book if not intends tu h red on end; thi avthor ~~offe~~s it for the amusement of occasional leisure'; and if wi found it so amusin that wi cud not put it dovn vntil satyty disngnably overcame vs, thatt can hardly bi imputed tu him for a favlt. Th index show that some 2,000 words are delt wich in 190 pagis, so that the compresion is somewhat sivire; wi think that condensation if a snare in this subject, and rigret it the more in Mr. Weekley's book because his brevity my

¹ **The Romance of Words.** By Ernest Weekley. (Murray, 3s. 6d. net).

THE GLAMOUR OF GRAMMAR

sometimes misliid. Thvs, on page 8 wi find, The mizen mast is the rearmost of three, but the Fr. mat de misaine is the foremast, and both come from Ital. mezzana, which means "middle" . ' Anaveragruder if led tu conclude that mezzana originally mint die man' mast in a three mastid vessel; bvt ther if no avihority for this, nor dus Mr. Weekley ither state it or mun it. Mezzana my hav bun the name of a sort of trj 'seil, and the mast that carry d it my bi nam d from it. Bvt the sentence in the book looks as if thi avikor was makin an amusin point bi a suppressio veri. in Grandpre's old Repertoire polyglotte de la Marine, thi avikor wildly conjecture that Ce mot qu'on devrait ecrire mizene if diryu'd from Misenus, the companion of Æneas in Virgil:—

Le nom de misaine est un hommage que l'antique tradition rendit au trompette d'Enee qui donna aussi son nom au cappres duquel il fut enterre. Vour savoir qui a raison dans l'emplacement de ce mot, il faudrait savoir ou se tenait le trompette du general, toutporte d croire que Valinure se tenait augouvernail et Mizene d la proue; et dans ce cas, nous aurions mieux place son mat que les Anglais.'

THE GLAMOUR OF GRAMMAR

On page 40 in an interesting section wi riid:—

'certain christian names are curiously associated with stupidity___English has, or had, in the sense of "fool" the words ninny, nickum, noddie, zany. . . . Nickum and noddie are probably for Nico detnus or Nicholas, both of which are used in French for a fool . . . Noddie-peak, ninny-hammer, nickum-poop, now nincompoop, seem to be arbitrary elaborations.'

Nickum sums finally tu discredit the well-known suggestion that nincompoop is connected with non-compos. Wi gratefully accept Nickum, bvt whence comes 'poop? Poop is; us'd commonly bi scollboys for a stypid fellow, and whether it bi abbriivextid from nin compoop, or hav a possibly independent origin, thi use of it prcoves an inherent propriety, and it turs up agein in lirrypoop. Nov, wi shud with tu vrge that this inhurent propriety, whether or not suggestid in this case bi non-compos, was the cause of theform of the word; and wi hav fliofen this example in order tu hid vp tu a general remark. Boflt Dr. Bradley and Mr. Vearsall Smith are well on their gard ageinst fanciful assumptions, and it if probably out of cavtion that they under-

THE GLAMOUR OF GRAMMAR

estimat, as it sums tu vs, thi 'emotional connotation of svme words as the cause of their form. Dr. Bradley goef so far as tu sty, lhere is something in the sound of a word that jits it to receive an " emotional connotation"' and wi hav borrow'd his ixpresion; but if won shud wer say that sudh and such a word if suggestiv of its objct, won if generally asur'd 'bi the psychologist that the sym' pathy bitwiin the twco if imagin'd and has grown vp from association, it cannot bi dinid that this my sum' times bi the case, but thi other rial condition must be very friiquent. it if the fact that words are bandy'd abovt in varivs formf and that their forms change, and that certan forms proove vital and are silectid; and it if Purely the same sense which molds and silects them that recoy nizis dieir proprity when silectid. if wi fill poop tu hav an motional connotation and recognize it af biir admirably ixpressiv of fool', no davt it waf for diatt very nifon that the wvrd arofe and rimein'd. Mr. Vear' sail Smith followf Dr. Bradley in classifiin svm of the simplist syggestions of certan vavils and consonants; thise ehmentary data are convincing, and did the svb' jut if liable tu fanciful err orf, yet its scientific basis if very sicyire. Wi hav not dvnejvstice tu Mr. Weekley's book. For a sample of its trefvrf wi wil transcribe from

THE GLAMOUR OF GRAMMAR

it the gloss on die word Lummel in "Ludwig's dictionary":—

'Lummel. A long lubber, a lazy lubber, a slouch, a lordant, a lordane, a looby, a booby, a tony, a fop, a dunce, a simpleton, a wiseacre, a sot, a logger Athead, a blockhead, a nickampoop, a lingerer, a drowsy or dreaming lusk, a pill garlick, a slowback, a lathback, a pitiful sneaking fellow, a lungio, a tall slim fellow, a slim long'back, a great he fellow, a lubberly fellow, a lozel, an awkward fellow!

The ruder wil probably rigret diat Herr Ludwig did not write the whole of this article.

NOTES
ON THE
PHONETIC ALPHABET

COMPLETE TABLE OF THE VOWELS

accented.	unaccented.	accented or unaccented.	
			as in—
<i>a</i>			<i>father</i>
		<i>ä</i>	<i>hat</i>
	<i>ʌ</i>		<i>ago, general, a.</i> ¹
<i>av</i>		<i>av</i>	<i>avtomn, a thority, all.</i>
<i>ε</i>			<i>bed.</i> ²
		<i>u, y</i>	<i>made, dy.</i>
			{ <i>abate.</i> (As a mute, denoting length of pre
	<i>e</i>		ceding vowel.)
			{ <i>heven.</i> (Vocalizing a liquid.)
			{ <i>the.</i> (Before a consonant.)
<i>ʌ</i>	<i>ʔ</i>		<i>green, ricall;</i> ⁴ <i>thi.</i> (Before a vowel)
		<i>i</i>	<i>it.</i>
		<i>ɨ</i>	<i>miht, bi.</i>
		<i>o</i>	<i>hot</i>
		<i>o</i>	<i>open.</i>
		<i>u</i>	<i>full.</i>
<i>œ</i>			<i>moon.</i>
		<i>u</i>	<i>unite.</i>
		<i>ʊ</i>	<i>but.</i>
		<i>av</i>	<i>hov.</i>
		<i>y</i>	<i>lyric, pity.</i>

NOTES ON THE VOWELS

1. The form of this symbol was chosen to picture the sound that it stands for; viz. an imperfect *a*—one whose characteristic sound is blurred through being unaccented.

To read *paradox* and *Asia*, for example, may serve to remind a deliberate, careful speaker not to say *paradox*, *Add*.

2. Some writers may choose to use *e*, in preference to *i*, for certain syllables which carry a secondary accent only; thus, the last syllable in *tendernes*, *l^hthearttdnes*:—

and for p. participles, bearing a secondary accent, as *cvmforted*:—

also for certain words with the prefix *e x*, *en*, &c. —if pronounced *e x* rather than *i x*, even when the vowel is unaccented: viz. *example*, *encliant*. Robert Bridges would have advocated this pronunciation and spelling; and in such words as the above, where the second vowel is undoubtedly accented, the reader would not be misled. A few other exceptions to accentuation of *t* are *index*, *content*, &c.

3. The use *ofe*, as a mute, sometimes to soften *c*, but chiefly to distinguish long from short final syllables, is explained in Prose V.

Further it is permitted to write mute *e* at the end of certain monosyllables, which, by virtue of their sense, carry weight, even if their vowel be short by nature: thus *Ivve*, and occasionally *dvne*, *gone*, &c. And we write *svme* or *svm*, according to sentence stress.

4. followed by *e*, as in *share*, *duse*, is accented, *iw* is accented, as in *fiw*, *biwtiful*, and *ia* as in *rial*, *diar*, &c.

For those who have not seen No. V, it should be explained that this symbol, , stands for *i*, and for *i :*, in the I.P.A. alphabet. It was the intention of the designer (R.B.) to approximate the shape to some form of *i*, which would in all probability be eventually substituted.

Note.—We write *book*, *look*, &c, in order to change as little as possible the appearance of these common words. And, for the same reason, *truth frut*, , &c., instead of *trooth, frcot*: this cannot mislead as *y* (cons.) never occurs after *r* before *oo*.

Capitals are not dealt with. Proper names are unchanged and quotations given in the original spelling.

RULES

FOR THE EFFECT OF ON PRECEDING VOWELS

RULE I

In standard English,

The vowels, *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, *υρο*, and the digraph *av* (except in *cowry*) are followed by the sound of *e*, before *r*. In some words this sound is represented by the symbol *e* written before the *r* as in *aerate*, or after the *r* as in *flare*, *fire*, *more*, *pure*, but often its presence is indicated by no symbol, as in *Mary*, *stiir*, *poor*.

RULE 2

In an orthographically closed syllable ending in *r*, or *r* followed by another consonant—

or has the sound of *aur(ar) nor, fort*.

vr „ „ *err for, hurt*.

ir „ „ *err stir, squirt*.

er „ „ *err her, herd, confer*.¹

Inflected and derived forms remain unaltered: thus, *stirrin* *furry*.

¹ *er* is always accented, whereas *er* is always unaccented.

RULE

FOR THE EFFECT OF *W*, *wh*, and *qu* ON THE
FOLLOWING *a*.

In standard English,

a following *w*, *wh*, and *qu* has the sound of *o*: thus—*was*, *that*, *quarrel*.

[Except before *ck*, *g*, *ng*, and *x*; as *whack*, *wag*, *wangle*, *wax*.]

THE CONSONANTS

The following are unchanged:

b d f h j k l m n p q r t u w x y z.

c is soft before *ε e i η i j γ.*

c is hard before all other vowels and diphthongs.

g is always soft, thus *gem, manag.*

g „ hard, „ *go, get.*

s has four forms:

s as in *soft* (unvoiced) *s* as in *was* (voiced)

s „ *sugar* „ *S* „ *measure* „

LIGATURES

n as in *sing* *sh* as in *ship*

th „ *thin* (unvoiced) *si* = *sh* „ *Asia*

th „ *the* (voiced) *ci* = *sh* „ *social*

WH „ *what* *ti* = *sh* „ *notion*

When *ch* or *wh*, unligatured, are used at the beginning of a word, one of the letters is mute: thus, *Christian*, where *h* is mute; *whco*, where *w* is mute.

Note. Phonetically, 5 symbols are unnecessary for the sound *sh* (*f*), but we retain all of them in use at present to avoid the otherwise unfamiliar appearance of words.

Several mute consonants are retained, thus: *two*), *answer*; *know*, *knife*; *half*, *thavht*. Also *of* is always written thus, and not *ov*. But these are matters for personal choice.

Bridges : Collected Essays XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX

